

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 17-21 stand rejected. Claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are objected to. Claims 11 and 21 are amended herein. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

### **35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection**

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 21 has been amended to overcome the rejection. The Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn accordingly.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 8-14, and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,362 (Van Der Gouwe) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,009 (Williams). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the following discussion.

The Examiner admits that “Van Der Gouwe and Williams do not teach inserting a first / second group of call information elements wherein the second group of the call information elements do not correspond to the second group of the setup message”, as required by claim 1 (OA, p. 3, line 21 – p. 4, line 2). The Examiner makes no further mention of these limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the art of record does not disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claim 1.

Thus, the Applicant asserts that independent claim 1 includes features that are neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Van Der Gouwe and Williams, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 11 and 21 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-14, and 17-20 depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant, therefore, refrains from a discussion of these dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

Dependent claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are otherwise allowable. The Applicant contends that the objection should be withdrawn in light of the discussion above distinguishing Van Der Gouwe and Williams.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based upon the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interest of clarity and brevity. The Applicant thus respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shannon L. Silversmith/

### **SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Shannon L. Silversmith, Reg. No. 60,938  
Setter Roche LLP  
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

### **Correspondence address:**

### **CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe  
Sprint Law Department  
6450 Sprint Parkway  
Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461  
Overland Park, KS 66251